

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

<p>LARRY A. THOMPSON,</p> <p style="text-align:center">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align:center">v.</p> <p>NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, ROBERT P. HOUSTON, Director Department of Corrections, and FRED BRITTEN, Warden Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.,</p> <p style="text-align:center">Respondents.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>CASE NO. 8:12CV191</p> <p>MEMORANDUM AND ORDER</p>
---	--	---

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On October 18, 2012, the court dismissed Petitioner's habeas corpus claims with prejudice and entered judgment against him. (Filing Nos. [15](#) and [16](#).) Thereafter, Petitioner filed a timely Notice of Appeal of the court's Judgment. (Filing No. [19](#).) To date, Petitioner has not filed a Motion for Certificate of Appealability.

A petitioner cannot appeal an adverse ruling on his petition for writ of habeas corpus under § 2254 unless he is granted a certificate of appealability. [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\)\(1\)](#); [Fed. R. App. P. 22\(b\)\(1\)](#). A certificate of appealability cannot be granted unless the petitioner "has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\)\(2\)](#). To make such a showing, "[t]he petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." [Slack v. Daniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 \(2000\)](#).

Petitioner failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right in his Petition. The court is not persuaded that the issues raised in the Petition and Amended Petition are debatable among reasonable jurists, that a court could resolve the

issues differently, or that the issues deserve further proceedings. Accordingly, the court will not issue a certificate of appealability in this case.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. The court will not issue a certificate of appealability in this matter; and
2. Because Petitioner was allowed to proceed in forma pauperis in this matter, he may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization from this court. [Fed. R. App. P. 24\(a\)\(3\)](#).

DATED this 1st day of April, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp
Chief United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.